UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,129	11/29/2006	Matteo Zoppas	207,059	4522

38137 7590 03/15/2010

ABELMAN, FRAYNE & SCHWAB
666 THIRD AVENUE, 10TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10017

EXAMINER	
LUK, EMMANUEL S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1791	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
03/15/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/541,129	ZOPPAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	EMMANUEL S. LUK	1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 January 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 are pending.

2. The arguments set forth by the applicants have been considered and are not persuasive. The applicants have argued that the Domodossola apparatus is of limited relevance since the turret is moved horizontally towards a stationary platen. The applicants have focused this feature in Figure 2A (which was never mentioned in the rejection). The rejection using Domodossola is focused upon the turret block that can move vertically, which is part of an alternative embodiment as seen in Figures 5-7, that shows the use of this feature in moving the turret to be close to place the products accurately upon a mandrel block (Col. 7, line 48). This is of relevance since it is known in the art for a vertical displacement of a turret between an upper and lower position.

Next, Applicants argues the shortcomings of the Van Manen reference. The applicants have focused the certain features of the Van Manen reference but did not discuss the relevant features of the extraction table which is located beneath a rotating turret and is relevant since such placement of the extraction table into the Coran reference would not radically change the device. The applicants argue that none of the cited references discusses a revolving turret that translates vertically is incorrect since the Domodossola does teach this feature. The concept of a revolving turret that can translate is known in the art and is relevant the present references.

The combinations of the Coran reference with the features taught by Van Manen and Domodossola would result in the claimed device and method, the applicants should note that the Coran reference teaches the mold parts, the extraction arm, the revolving

turret around the horiztonal axis, the turret cools down and preforms and can hold and release the preforms via vacuum down to a receiving table. The features taught by Van Manen and Domodossola would be relevant to a rotating turret and with the extraction table beneath a rotating turret. After reviewing the claimed invention and the applicant's arguments, it is not persuasive and rejections stand.

3. The 112 rejection of the claims have been withdrawn in light of the amended claims that have corrected the means plus function language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coran in view of van Manen (2001/0019730) and Domodossola (6143225)

Coran teaches the claimed apparatus having a two mold halves (45), extraction arm 2, revolving turret (3) with cool down cups (6), as seen in Figures 1 and 9-19, the turret revolves about a horizontal axis and the objects permit the preforms to be collected and cooled and then dropped down below, see Figure 18. The preforms are collected by collection means [0080].

Coran fails to teach a vertical moving turret and an extraction table below the turret.

van Manen teaches a molding apparatus 1 with two mold plates 3, 4, with mold parts 5, 5' for moving towards and away from each other, the robot 8 having a rotary rotor with four arms 9 to 12, see Figure 3, arm 12 with carrier 16 reaches into the mold, the robot can rotate about a central axis, in position A, the robot arm takes up the preforms from the mold, in position B and C, the performs can cool, in lower position D,t he performs are removed from the receiving tubes, see [0021] to [0023]. As shown by van Manen, the central pull-out device 21 incorporates pairs of clamping strips 36a, 36b, 37a, 37b, see Figure 6, with the clamping strips moving toward and away from each other and are capable of gripping the preforms from the cooling pipes, see [0028] to [0030]. As seen in Figure 6, the strips includes recesses 40, that are similar to teethes for grasping the articles, see [0034]. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Coran with the extraction table as taught by van Manen below the rotary turret to positively remove the articles from the turret.

Domodossola teaches a molding machine having the mold halves that form the articles, the articles are removed and placed upon a post mold cooling device, this device being a rotating turret block 34 (see Figures 5 and 6) that rotates and further moves in a vertical position such that the articles can be placed upon an extraction device (mandrel block and track system 98, 100). The movement of the turret block 34 allows for accurate placement of the finished parts down upon the mandrel block 98 (see Col. 7, lines 46-50). van Manen teaches the movement of the extraction table to the turret for removal of the articles and Domodossola teaches the movement of the turret down to the mandrel block for the article release, thus both references are

pertinent as both teaches the turret and/or device that is brought into position with each other on the vertical plane. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Coran, in view of van Manen, with the vertical moving turret block as taught by Domodossola because it allows for accurate placement of the finished parts upon the next device.

Coran, Domodossola, and van Manen are all related to the injection molding arts and for forming of preforms and for post conditioning of the articles after molding, thus one skilled in the art would recognize the features and incorporate these features especially in light of the similar scope of endeavor of the references in which Domodossola, van Manen, and Coran have rotating turrets.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EMMANUEL S. LUK whose telephone number is (571)272-1134. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Fridays from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yogendra N Gupta/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791

EL